REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-2, 4, 10-24, 55-56, 58, 72-114, 116-215, and 236-255 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 55, 72, 210, and 252-255 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated January 26, 2009, Claims 1-2, 4, 10-24, 55-56, 58, 72-114, 116-215, and 236-255 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-2, 4, 10-24, 55-56, 58, 72-114, 116-215, and 236-255 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

1. Initial Matters

Applicants note that Examiner states on page 2 of the Final Office Action that "Cameron, as admitted by applicant discloses translating IP addresses from one device to another having a different subnet." Applicants have nowhere admitted that Cameron teaches the limitations as described by Examiner. As illustrated below, Cameron indeed does not teach the elements as alleged by Examiner.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 20, 55-56, 72-79, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 210-214, 228, and 236-247 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 4, 20, 55-56, 72-79, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 210-214, 228, and 236-247 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212919). Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection because combining *Edson* with *Cameron* and/or *Tsang* would not have led to the claimed invention. Claim 1 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "network address translation (NAT) logic configured to determine security and control settings, and if the determination indicates a need for elevated security, translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device to a NAT process IP address such that the NAT process IP address has a subnet different than the management IP address". Amended Claims 55, 72, and 210 each include a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least in paragraphs [0182] – [0186].

Notably, the Final Office Action does not even allege that the combination teaches this feature, and apparently (based on the language of the rejection, reproduced below) analyzed a previously amended version of the claims:

> Cameron teaches a radio frequency cable network device that implements at least one gateway service, the device comprising:
> "network address translation logic configured to translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device (organization) to a second IP address having a subnet (external addresses) different than the first IP address (paragraph [0091])..
> (Office Action, p. 4)

The cited paragraph *Cameron* contains a brief discussion of network address translation, reproduced below:

> NAT Network Address Translation. An Internet standard that enables a local-area network (LAN) to use one set of IP addresses for internal traffic and a second set of addresses for external traffic. A NAT box located where the LAN meets the Internet makes all necessary IP address translations. NATs serve two main purposes: They provide a type of firewall by hiding internal IP addresses and they enable a company to use more internal IP addresses. Since they're only used internally, there's no possibility of conflict with IP addresses used by other companies and organizations.
> (Cameron, para. 0091)

Cameron thus appears to disclose translating from an internal address to an external address. However, this does not teach the specific feature recited in Claim 1: network address translation logic configured to translate "such that the second IP address has a subnet different than the

management IP address". Neither *Edson* nor *Tsang et al* appear to discuss network address translation at all.

Combining *Edson* with *Cameron* and/or *Tsang* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Edson, Cameron,* and *Tsang,* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "network address translation (NAT) logic configured to determine security and control settings, and if the determination indicates a need for elevated security, translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device to a NAT process IP address such that the NAT process IP address has a subnet different than the management IP address", as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 55, 72, and 210 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210.

Dependent Claims 2, 4, 20, 56, 73-79, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 211-214, 228, and 236-247 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2, 4, 20, 56, 73-79, 86, 90-92, 127-128, 135, 160-161, 167, 171, 173-174, 211-214, 228, and 236-247.

3. Rejection of Claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785). The addition of *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson, Cameron* and *Tsang et al,* discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since

independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10-12, 149-150, and 156 be withdrawn.

4. Rejection of Claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 13-19, 21-24, 58, 80-85, 87-89, 130-134, 136-138, 165, and 169 be withdrawn.

5. Rejection of Claims 93-94, 100, 104-106, 112, 116-117, and 123 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 93-94, 100, 104-106, 112, 116-117, and 123 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Hooper* (U.S. 5,414,455). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Hooper* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 93-94, 100, 104-106,

112, 116-117, and 123 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 93-94, 100, 104-106, 112, 116-117, and 123 be withdrawn.

6. Rejection of Claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Hooper* (U.S. 5,414,455) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Hooper* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 95-99, 101-103, 107-111, 113-115, 118-122, and 124-126 be withdrawn.

7. Rejection of Claim 129 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 129 is rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Bowser* (U.S. 6,870,570). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Bowser* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 129 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 129 be withdrawn.

8. Rejection of Claim 139 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 139 is rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Okano* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0062485). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Okano* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 139 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 139 be withdrawn.

9. Rejection of Claims 140-144 and 146-148 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 140-144 and 146-148 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Okano* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0062485) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Okano* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 140-144 and 146-148 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 140-144 and 146-148 be withdrawn.

10. Rejection of Claims 151-155, 157-159, 181, and 185 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 151-155, 157-159, 181, and 185 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Na* and *Nazarathy*

does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*,

discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since

independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims

151-155, 157-159, 181, and 185 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from

an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 151-155,

157-159, 181, and 185 be withdrawn.

11. Rejection of Claims 162-164, 168, and 170 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 162-164, 168, and 170 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over

Edson (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub.

No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully

traverses this rejection. The addition of *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the

combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with

independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210

are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 162-164, 168, and 170 are allowable

for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully

requests that the rejection of claims 162-164, 168, and 170 be withdrawn.

12. Rejection of Claims 175-176 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 175-176 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S.

6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No.

2006/0212929), and further in view of *Tseng* (U.S. 5,582,714). Applicant respectfully traverses

this rejection. The addition of *Tseng* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*,

Cameron and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72,

and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 175-176 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends

from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 175-176 be withdrawn.

13. Rejection of Claims 177 and 183 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 177 and 183 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Tseng* (U.S. 5,582,714) and *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Tseng* and *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 177 and 183 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 177 and 183 be withdrawn.

14. Rejection of Claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785) and *Nazarathy* (6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Na* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 178-180, 182, 184, and 186 be withdrawn.

15. Rejection of Claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 187-188, 194, 198-199, and 215 be withdrawn.

16. Rejection of Claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 189-191, 193-195, and 197 be withdrawn.

17. Rejection of Claims 192 and 196 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 192 and 196 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727)

and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 192 and 196 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 192 and 196 be withdrawn.

18. Rejection of Claims 200 and 206 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 200 and 206 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Na* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 200 and 206 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 200 and 206 be withdrawn.

19. Rejection of Claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0212929), and further in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592), *Na* (U.S. 6,993,785), and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer*, *Na,* and *Nazarathy* does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson*, *Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant

respectfully submits that claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 are allowable for at least the reason

that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of

claims 201-203, 205, 207, and 209 be withdrawn.

20. Rejection of Claims 204 and 208 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 204 and 208 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S.

6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al* (U.S. Pub. No.

2006/0212929), and further in view of *Sawyer* (U.S. 6,487,592) and *Nazarathy* (U.S. 6,490,727).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Sawyer* and *Nazarathy* does not

cure the deficiencies of the combination of *Edson, Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above

in connection with independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims

1, 55, 72, and 210 are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 204 and 208 are

allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant

respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 204 and 208 be withdrawn.

21. Rejection of Claims 248-251 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Dependent Claims 248-251 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson*

(U.S. 6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al.* (U.S. Pub. No.

2006/0212919) and further in view of *Hirose* (U.S. Pub No. 2001/0049825). Applicant

respectfully traverses this rejection. The addition of *Hirose* does not cure the deficiencies of the

combination of *Edson, Cameron* and *Tsang et al*, discussed above in connection with

independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210. Therefore, since independent Claims 1, 55, 72, and 210

are allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 248-251 are allowable for at least the

reason that each depends from an allowable claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the

rejection of claims 248-251 be withdrawn.

22. <u>Rejection of Claims 248-255 under 35 U.S.C. §103</u>

Claims 248-255 are rejected under §103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Edson* (U.S.

6,526,581) in view of *Cameron* (U.S. 2005/0028206) and *Tsang et al.* (U.S. Pub. No.

2006/0212919) and further in view of *Hirose* (U.S. Pub No. 2001/0049825). Applicants

respectfully traverses the rejection because combining *Edson* with *Cameron*, *Tsang*, and/or

Hirose would not have led to the claimed invention. Claim 252 has been amended, and

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new

matter.

Amended Claim 252 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the

reason that it recites, for example, "network address translation (NAT) logic configured to

determine security and control settings, and if the determination indicates a need for elevated

security, translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data

device such that the one of the packets appears to be sent from the stored MAC address

associated with the first CPE address when the one of the packets is communicated across the

at least one RF cable interface". Amended Claims 253, 254, and 255 each include a similar

recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least in

paragraphs [0182] – [0186].

The cited paragraph in *Cameron* contains a brief discussion of network address

translation, reproduced below:

> NAT Network Address Translation. An Internet standard that enables a
> local-area network (LAN) to use one set of IP addresses for internal traffic
> and a second set of addresses for external traffic. A NAT box located
> where the LAN meets the Internet makes all necessary IP address
> translations. NATs serve two main purposes: They provide a type of
> firewall by hiding internal IP addresses and they enable a company to use
> more internal IP addresses. Since they're only used internally, there's no
> possibility of conflict with IP addresses used by other companies and
> organizations.

(Cameron, para. 0091)

Cameron thus appears to disclose translating from an internal address to an external address. However, this does not teach the specific feature recited in claim 252: network address translation logic configured to "translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device such that the one of the packets appears to be sent from the stored MAC address associated with the first CPE address when the one of the packets is communicated across the at least one RF cable interface". Neither *Edson* nor *Tsang et al* appear to discuss network address translation at all.

Hirose does not remedy the deficiencies of *Edson, Cameron,* and *Tsang. Hirose* merely appears to disclose the storage of available MAC addresses each corresponding to a different destination. ([0033]-[0034]).

Combining *Edson* with *Cameron, Tsang,* and/or *Hirose* would not have led to the claimed subject matter because *Edson, Cameron, Tsang,* and *Hirose* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "network address translation (NAT) logic configured to determine security and control settings, and if the determination indicates a need for elevated security, translate an IP address in one of the packets that is destined for the first CPE data device such that the one of the packets appears to be sent from the stored MAC address associated with the first CPE address when the one of the packets is communicated across the at least one RF cable interface", as recited by amended Claim 252. Amended Claims 253, 254, and 255 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 252, 253, 254, and 255 are distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 252, 253, 254, and 255.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any

additional required fees to our Deposit Account No.13-2725

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: <u>April 27, 2009</u>   <u>/dr/   </u>
                                        David Rodack

                                        Reg. No. 47,034

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066

MIK/ak